

UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Name: Curriculum 2018-2019

Number of Meetings Held this Year: Ten 150-minute open hearings

Committee Chair: Marci Carrasquillo

Committee Members: (list here)

Ozge Uygur	Phillip Lewis	Joy Cypher
Daniel Strasser	Jiyeon Lee	Tyrone McCombs
Robert Hesketh	Ravi Ramachandran	Michelle Pich
Maria Rosado	Claire Falck	Adam Kolek
Leslie Elkins	Shari Willis	Nancy Tinkham
Jennifer Matthews	David Vaccaro	Joel Rudin
Ravi Dhruv (SGA)		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Reviews proposals for title and credit changes, minors, concentrations, specializations, major programs, courses, certifications, reorganization of academic department/college offerings, and new or revised University-wide curricular patterns; reviews proposals to create, dissolve, or significantly reconstitute academic departments or colleges; forwards recommendations to the Senate and then to the executive vice president/provost.

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. As of this writing*, 431 curriculum proposals were submitted for review during AY 2018-19. 424 proposals were processed (seven proposals were withdrawn by sponsors during the college level review). The full committee convened to review major proposal process types D, E, F, and Q (97 proposals or 24% of the total submissions). Process types A, B, and C were reviewed by the committee's Chair (327 proposals or 76% of the total submissions). A breakdown of proposals submitted by process type follows:

Process Type

Proposals

A – new courses; minor changes to existing, non-general education courses: 254

B – new general education courses; minor changes to existing gen ed courses:	**16
C – minor changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	57
D – major changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	35
D – new 4 + 1 undergraduate/graduate dual degree:	5
E – new degree-related program (Minor, Concentration, CUGS, COGS, CAGS, Post-Baccalaureate Certificate):	42
F – new degree program (BA, BS, MA, MS, PhD):	7
Q – quasi-curricular:	8

*Numbers are subject to change due to very late proposal submissions.

** Refer to the Rowan Core Committee’s report for more information on general education-related proposals submitted in AY 2018-19. The number presented in this report represents the number of “B” proposals in the AY 2018-19 SCC database at the time of this writing. The number does not account for any proposals that may have been submitted directly/solely to the RCC and that have not been presented yet to the SCC for consideration.

2. Between May 2018 and March 2019, the SCC Chair attended a number of meetings with Senate President Bill Freind, representatives from the Provost’s Office, and other members of the university community to obtain a new system for processing curriculum proposals that is appropriate for a research university of this size. Rather than purchase off-the-shelf software, the university administration elected to work with the vendor Hyland Global to create a custom solution for managing the curriculum review process. Beginning in Fall 2019, all curriculum proposals, including general education proposals, will be submitted and reviewed through the new *OnBase* system. In collaboration with the SCC, the RCC, Senate office staff, the Senate President, original project team members from IRT, and the Provost’s Office, the SCC Chair will update all process guidelines as well as the SCC webpage to align everything with the new system. The university community should expect to see these updates in advance of the Fall 2019 curriculum cycle.

-use additional pages if required

Committee Name: Curriculum 2018-2019

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

2019-2020

- The SCC suggests re-thinking submission deadlines for curriculum proposals; rolling deadlines may be more suitable for some proposal types.
- The SCC suggests revising the committee description that is posted on the Senate website (to remove outmoded language and to update committee responsibilities).
- As of this writing, 431 curriculum proposals were submitted for review during AY 2018-19; this is a 13% increase from last year and a 43% increase from AY 2015-16. The previous committee chair did not file a report for AY 2016-17 but a trendline from the available data predicts that the SCC will receive and process approximately 470 submissions in AY 2019-20. With such a heavy workload, the SCC Chair needs adequate release time to fulfill this service obligation. The committee suggests a minimum of 6 s.h. automatic release time per term.
- The SCC very strongly recommends Information Resources and Technology's Training Services offer a series of training opportunities over the course of AY 2019-20 (perhaps two or three per semester) to assist the university community with learning to use the new OnBase curriculum system. Providing additional training opportunities surely will make for a smoother transition to the new curriculum review process.